



10 DOWNING STREET

Prime Minister

Meeting of the 1922 Committee - Thursday, 12th June, 1980.

1. This was a very well attended meeting, as we had a vote at 7 p.m.
2. Stephen Hastings and Bill Clark both raised the question of Clause 16 of the Employment Bill. They said that the Clause as now drafted did not meet the Manifesto commitment. They asked that the Government should accept Ian Orr-Ewing's amendments in the Lords, which they said would give effect to the Manifesto commitment. They further asked that Jim should come before the Committee in order to explain why Clause 16 did not go further than it does. Each of these two short speeches received applause.
3. The third speaker was Nicholas Scott, Chairman of our Employment Committee, and close friend to Prior. He said that the Government would be introducing a further Green Paper on the Clause 16 issue later in the year; that it would not be right to rush into accepting amendments in the Lords in advance of the Green Paper, and that Jim Prior would be appearing before the Employment Committee before the Recess, so that Members would have an opportunity of putting any questions to him then.
4. I have to report (reluctantly) that Scott's contribution was received with substantially more applause than the earlier contributions of Hastings and Clark.
5. Du Cann then said that he had been in correspondence with Jim Prior about Clause 16, in order to express the anxieties of some members of the Executive of the 1922 Committee (I have not seen this correspondence). Du Cann went on to say that earlier that afternoon the officers of the National Executive Committee had had one of their regular meetings with the Executive of the 1922 Committee. Du Cann explained that those Officers had reported that there was a substantial body of opinion in the Party in the country which felt, very strongly, that our Clause 16 did not meet the Manifesto commitment and that, in effect, the voters had been given a false prospectus last May. It may be that Du Cann will be writing to you to report about this.
6. Ian Percival lunched with me today and said that although he was not present at the meeting between the Executive of the 1922 Committee and the Officers of the N.E.C., it had been reported to him that those who spoke most strongly against the existing Clause 16 were Charles Johnston, Oulton Wade and Herbert Redfearn (who, as you will remember, asked a question about this at the N.E.C. Dinner on Wednesday).

/cont.....

7. Winston Churchill then raised the question of the proposed sale of Ferranti to G.E.C. He is most concerned about the continuing independence of Ferranti and is fearful of what may happen to Ferranti if it is devoured by Arnold Weinstock. Although nobody else spoke on this subject, later enquiries show that there is anxiety on this subject among about twenty of our backbenchers.

8. The next speaker was Eldon Griffiths. He said that he had a great respect for the Chairman of our Party; but that he regretted the speech which Peter had made in the Lords on the previous day. Herewith House of Lords Hansard for 11th June, 1980. In fact Peter made a quite outstanding speech. The part to which Eldon objected was the last paragraph (Col. 463). Eldon made three points:-

- (a) It was wrong for Peter to have given advice to Boyle.
- (b) Peter's speech appeared to be saying that there should be an incomes policy or a norm. (Eldon is quite wrong about this.)
- (c) That, by long established custom, the remuneration of Members of Parliament was a matter for the House of Commons itself, and not for the House of Lords.

9. I regret to say that there was some applause at the end of Eldon's contribution.

10. Matthew Parris and Kenneth Carlisle (each of whom has written to you) spoke in favour of accepting substantially less than whatever the Boyle uprating might be.

11. Patrick Wall said that we really ought to defer discussion about Member's pay until after we received Boyle's report.

12. Tony Kershaw said that we ought certainly not to accept the full Boyle uprating.

13. Jock Bruce-Gardyne defended Peter vigorously and said that there was no way that we could accept a further Boyle uprating.

14. Patrick Cormack criticised Peter's speech; emphasised that the question of our remuneration was a matter for the House of Commons itself; and urged that, MPs themselves taking the lead, we should accept significantly less than Boyle.

15. Kenneth Lewis defended Peter, but said that we ought to take whatever Boyle recommended.

16. Alan Clark said that we must accept substantially whatever recommendation Boyle might make.

17. Du Cann then made his own (predictable) contribution:-

- (a) He regretted the rejection of the advice which he had given to you a year ago. If his advice had been followed then, we would not be in the difficulty and embarrassment in which we find ourselves today.

(b) Nevertheless, any decision by the House ought to take into account both the national interest and the policy of the Government.

(c) We must all behave now with restraint and dignity; the less said before Boyle reported, the better.

(d) Any decision of the House must also take into account the urgent need to attract to Parliament people of the highest quality. The present level of our remuneration was derisory and this fact deterred people from coming into what he described as "public life".

18. From discussion, which I have had, I believe that there is now a majority view within the Parliamentary Party in favour of accepting less than Boyle. Nevertheless, Edward's view is very important. If he is able to say to the 1922 Committee that the officers and Executive recommend, say 12%, that will be a key factor in deciding how our backbenchers vote.

13th June, 1980

Ian Gow

P.S. You will enjoy reading Ralph Harris's excellent speech in the attached Hansard, at Col. 482.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

1. HASTINGS - EMPLOYMENT BILL - CLAUSE 16.
WILL PRIOR CONF.
GREEN PAPER.
2. CLARK.
3. SCOTT. These will be a Green Paper
Don't mind into amendments - pls Lats.
4. Dr. Carr. Needs with National Front
+ confidence with S.P.
5. CHAMBERLAIN. FERRELLI - maintain its
independence.
6. THE GRIFFITHS. HOUSE OF COMMONS SPEECH
OF P.T. ON MEMBERSHIP
 (a) Shall Peter give advice
 to, Income Policy or not.
 (c) Letter for House of Commons -
 they shall not take on
 business.
7. PARRIS. Soil Savin's bill to Home.
8. CARLISLE. Supports Parris.
9. WALK. Wait till we receive Bylaws.
10. KERSHAW. DO NOT TAKE FULL BODIES.
11. BAILEY - CARLISLE. DESIRES THOMAS CROSS
SUPPORT OUR CAUSE.

12 COAMARK

Citizens' Chair let
agree with Cabinet
rather for Home at least
for Govt. We should take
no more.

13. Remett Lewis.

Refers Thompson
let us not like less
than Boyle.

14 CLARK.

Suggests us.

15. Du CARM

(a) rejects rejects of advice the
June - year ago

b. Take what interest - Govt. policy
into account.

c. Balance with dignity.

d. But get sense of history
into public life.